

that "in this, as in other areas under the fairness doctrine, the type of programing and the amount and nature of time to be afforded is a matter for the good faith, reasonable judgment of the licensee, upon the particular facts of his situation. See *Cullman Broadcasting Co., F.C.C. 63-849* (Sept. 18, 1963)."

43. In other words, we agree with CBS that the "question of whether a licensee is responsibly complying with the fairness doctrine cannot be resolved by per se guidelines, ratios or other rigid rules." A licensee which has just presented a very lengthy program on this issue obviously might reach a different judgment as to what his obligation was in this respect for the next week or so. But as stated, the carriage of the normally substantial amount of weekly commercials raises a concomitant responsibility to be met over relatively the same period of time. Further, in these circumstances, while a 1 to 1 ratio is ruled out by considerations of the legislative history of the Cigarette Labeling Act, the licensee's obligation is just as clearly not met by an occasional program a few times a year or by some appropriate announcements once or twice a week. We stress again that what is called for is the allocation of a significant amount of time each week, absent unusual circumstances, to the presentation of the opposing viewpoint in the case of cigarette commercials. We do not see why licensees, proceeding in good faith, should experience any real difficulty in reasonably discharging that responsibility nor why, in view of the nature of the issue—the public's health, they would seek to fulfill that obligation in a niggardly fashion, designed to raise problems or complaints. In sum, we have not usurped licensee judgment as to the type of programing or the amount or nature of the time to be afforded, but rather have left these matters to the good faith, reasonable judgment of the licensee based on his evaluation of the facts of his particular case.²⁵

F. EFFECT OF THE RULING ON THE ADVERTISING OF PRODUCTS OTHER THAN CIGARETTES

44. Petitioners further assert that the ruling cannot logically be limited to cigarette advertising alone, and hence will have broad-scale effect on broadcast operations and the presentation of advertising by radio generally. They state that very little in society is uncontroversial and, since many products are subject to one form of controversy or other, an appeal to the Commission by a vocal minority is all that is needed to classify a subject as controversial and of public importance. They further claim that if governmental and private reports on the possible hazard of a product are a sufficient basis for the cigarette ruling, the ruling would apply to a host of other products, such as: automobiles, food with high cholesterol count, alcoholic beverages, fluoride in toothpaste, pesticide residue in food, aspirin, detergents, candy, gum, soft drinks, girdles, and even common table salt. We do not find this "parade of horrors" argument impressive.

45. We stressed in our ruling that it was "limited to this product—cigarettes," stating further in this connection:

"Governmental and private reports (e.g., the 1964 Report of the Surgeon General's Committee) and Congressional action (e.g., the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act of 1965) assert that the normal use of this product can be a hazard to the health of millions of persons. The advertisements in question clearly promote the use of a particular product as attractive and enjoyable. Indeed, they understandably have no other purpose. We believe that a station which presents such advertisements has the duty of informing its audience of the other side of this controversial issue of public importance—that however enjoyable, such smoking may be a hazard to the smoker's health."

Our ruling does not state, and was in no way meant to imply, that any appeal to the Commission by a vocal minority will suffice to classify advertising of a product as controversial and of public importance. Rather, the key factors here were twofold: (1) Governmental and private reports and Congressional action with respect to cigarettes, and (2) their assertion in common that "normal use of this product can be a hazard to the health of millions of persons."

46. The products to which petitioners refer do not present a comparable situa-

²⁵ It is also argued that the licensees may simply substitute cigarette health messages for other public service announcements now being carried. The duty of a station carrying cigarette commercials to inform the public as to the hazards of smoking stems directly from the fact that its facilities have been used to promote the use of this product found by the Congress and governmental reports to be so potentially hazardous to health; its responsibility is therefore the same as in the case of any other fairness situation. It thus has a duty to present the other side over and beyond what a licensee decides in other respects to present in order to serve the best interests of his area. We therefore do not believe that a licensee would or should adopt a pattern of operation which he does not adjudge to serve fully the needs and interests of his public.